



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/934,441	08/21/2001	Ronald E. Starr	069806-001	5313

29391 7590 05/14/2004

BEUSSE BROWNLEE WOLTER MORA & MAIRE, P. A.
390 NORTH ORANGE AVENUE
SUITE 2500
ORLANDO, FL 32801

EXAMINER

TO, BAOQUOC N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

7

DATE MAILED: 05/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/934,441

Applicant(s)

STARR, RONALD E.

Examiner

Baoquoc N To

Art Unit

2172

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-28 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1 and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. "without creating a compilable code" critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976).

The examiner assumes that the specification teaches this for the purpose of examination.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 03/08/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that "the current application does not need to create the compliable code as taught in the stack"

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument. As Stack states in col. 3, lines 20-24, "compilable or interpretable application program code is not generated. Consequently, such environments are difficult to design and maintain and make little provision for the production of documentation that is specific to a particular working application program." Due to the difficulties which was incurred in the past, the

improvement of generating of compilable code to ease the design and maintenance.

Since the production of documentation does not need to create compilable code in the art, the current recited claim limitations do not have novelty. The conceptual has been acknowledged and that's why stack's improvement to overcome such difficulties.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stack (US. Patent No. 5,815,717).

Regarding on claim 1 and 15, Stack teaches a computerized method for developing records management system customized to meet the ongoing information needs of users of a given enterprise application, the method comprising:

Providing a plurality of control table (control table 64) configurable by user having expertise in the enterprise application (expert system), with a first set of the control tables being configurable to define system-level operational functions (col. 5, lines 40-45), with a second set of control tables being configurable to define a selected input medium for uploading information into a repository database (input the data from user) (col. 5, lines 32-39), and with a third set of control tables being configurable to define a selected output medium for downloading information from the database (subordinate output program type) (col. 5, lines 64-66) ;

Providing an input/output device (pop-display prompts the user input) for accessing the plurality of control tables (col. 21, lines 14-20);

Populating each control table with prescribed rules provided by the user having expertise in the application through the input/output device for invoking a respective action in response to a user-triggered event (user input sufficiently qualify the desired function of the selected feature packet) (col. 21, lines 14-20); and

Stack does not explicitly teach processing the control tables to construct a respective record yet object array corresponding to the rules provided by the user having expertise in the application to produce in response to each constructed record set object array a customer records management system without creating a compilable code, with the system being accessible by the user through the selected input and output mediums in accordance with the prescribed rules provided by the user having expertise in the application. However, Stack teaches, "as features packets and functional logic are evaluated by this expert system, reference is made to a control table 64 that, in combination with rule table 62, operates as an abstract, multi level data look-up facility utilized in support of generating definite application sequences" (col. 24, lines 30-35). This teaches the control tables 64 constructing the application sequence (object array) by the rule table 62. In addition, Stack also suggests "compliant or interpretable program code is not generated" (col. 3, lines 20-21). By this suggestion, "the compilable or interpretable does not need to be generated" is known in the art because of the difficulty to maintain. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the control tables 64 to

construct the application sequence using rules would allow the program sequence in according to the order of created and generated the compilable code for easier to design and maintain.

Regarding on claims 2 and 16, Stack teaches the first control table set configurable to define the selected system-level operational functions comprises a menu control table (entire program) including menu and a plurality of sub-menu (subprogram) choices invocable by a respective user-triggered event (col. 8, lines 19-36).

Regarding on claims 3 and 17, Stack teaches the first control table set configurable to define the selected system-level operational functions further comprises a menu tree control table including a menu tree and a plurality of tree nodes invocable by a respective user-triggered event (col. 11, lines 29-45).

Regarding on claims 4 and 18, Stack teaches the menu control table is linkable to a search control table configured to define searchable keys for retrieving information for the database (col. 26, lines 65-67).

Regarding on claims 5 and 19, Stack teaches the menu control table is linkable to a data report control table configurable to activate a reporting wizard (reporting) for generating reports from the database (col. 8, lines 24-37).

Regarding on claims 6 and 20, Stack teaches the menu control table is linkable to menu tree control table including a menu tree and a plurality of tree nodes invocable by a respective user-triggered event (col. 8, lines 25-35).

Regarding on claims 7 and 21, Stack teaches the menu control table is linkable to an executable control table configurable to interface with programs external to the customized records management system (evaluation) (col. 8, lines 25-35).

Regarding on claims 8 and 22, Stack teaches the second control table set configurable to define the selected input medium for uploading information into the repository database comprises a form control table for gathering input data (col. 26, lines 65-67).

Regarding on claims 9 and 23, Stack teaches the form control table is selected from the group consisting of a form display control table, a data tree control table, a dropdown control table, a keypad control table, and a coversheet control table (col. 5, lines 60-67).

Regarding on claims 10 and 24, Stack teaches the third control table set configurable to define the selected output medium for downloading information from the repository database comprises a form display control table for displaying output data (col. 5, lines 60-67).

Regarding on claims 11 and 25, Stack teaches a data analysis control table configurable to perform predefined analysis on selected data in the database (col. 5, lines 60-67).

Regarding on claims 12 and 26, Stack teaches the user-triggered event comprises a computer-detectable interface event selected from the group consisting of a computer mouse event, a keyboard event, a pointer event, and a user-voice utterance event (plurality of input event) (col. 3, lines 44-47).

Regarding on claims 13 and 27, Stack teaches the customized records system is rebuildable to include any new customization as may be required by the ongoing information needs of the enterprise application based on any new prescribed rules provided by the expert to repopulate the control tables (col. 24, lines 24-52).

Regarding on claims 14 and 28, Stack teaches the customized records system is accessible to users and experts via a communication network selected from the group consisting of a local area network, a wide area network, an intranet, and the Internet (col. 6, lines 1-6).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Baoquoc N. To whose telephone number is (703) 305-

Application/Control Number: 09/934,441
Art Unit: 2172

Page 8

1949 or via e-mail BaoquocN.To@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached at (703) 305-9790.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231.


The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follow:

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Crystal Park II
2121 Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA 22202
Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Baoquoc N. To
May 10, 2004


JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER